

REMARKSRECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

AUG 04 2006

Request for Reconsideration

Applicants have carefully considered the matters raised by the Examiner in the outstanding Office Action but remain of the opinion that patentable subject matter is present. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the Examiner's position based on the above amendments to the claims and the following remarks.

Invention

One of the novel aspects of the present Invention is that the binder has side groups or side chains which function as the crosslinking group between the polymeric structures of the binder. In other words, the binder has a polymeric backbone off of which side chains are positioned and these side chains, through radiation, form the crosslink between the polymers. By employing this structure for the binder, it is possible to decrease the crosslinking density and increase the flexibility of the resulting dried layers. This increase in flexibility markedly improves the folding and fracture resistance of the dried layers. This aspect of the present Invention is

brought out in the middle paragraph on page 28 of the Application.

Examples of the structure of the side chains is discussed in the Application starting in the last paragraph on page 22 and going through page 27 of the Application.

The independent claims in this Application have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim this aspect of the present Invention.

Claim Status

Claims 1-20 are pending while Claims 1-10 are under prosecution and Claims 11-20 have been withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended herein to point out that the binder is a crosslinking group-modified polymer which is crosslinked by the crosslinking group. Support for this amendment can be found on page 22, lines 11-13 as well as page 28 in the first two paragraphs. Specific examples of the crosslinking can be seen on pages 23-27.

Claims 2 and 7 have also been amended to recite that the 4 mol % limitation is directed to the number of

crosslinking groups that are in the binder. Support for this amendment can be found in the first full paragraph on page 28 of the Application.

Specification Amendments

The paragraph bridging pages 52-53 has been amended herein to correct an obvious typographical error.

Request for Entry of the Amendment and Withdrawal of the Finality of the Office Action

The amendments made herein are to better define the binder and are necessitated by the fact that the Examiner has performed a further search and cited new art. Specifically, the Examiner did a search and identified Maeda and first applied Maeda in the June 5, 2006 Office Action.

In accordance with MPEP 706.07(a), it is submitted that a second or subsequent Office Action should not be made Final if it includes a rejection on prior art not of record. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the finality of the Office Action should be withdrawn and the

amendment should be entered given the fact that it was necessitated by the newly cited art and the new rejection.

Prior Art Rejection

Claims 1-10 had been rejected as being unpatentable over a combination of Barcock and Maeda.

Neither Barcock nor Maeda teach or suggest a crosslinking group-modified polymer as a binder. Specific binders in Barcock are outlined at Column 2, lines 45-55. None of those cited have crosslinking groups on the polymeric structure. The specific binders in Maeda are taught starting at Column 3, line 64 through Column 4, line 8. None of those binders are seen as being a crosslinking group-modified polymer. In fact, Barcock at Column 4, lines 16-20, teach specifically that his binder is free from radical polymerizable unsaturated bonds. This can be directly contrasted with the present Invention where it can be seen that the crosslinkable groups have unsaturated bonds, see pages 25-27.

In Maeda, his polymer structures break due to irradiation and crosslinking occurs at the breaks in the polymeric backbone. In contrast, the present Invention has

crosslinking groups which form the crosslink between the polymeric backbone. As brought out in the Application, this structure allows for improved flexibility and proved fracture resistance.

Thus, it is submitted that even if one were to take the binder from Maeda and add it to the composition of Barcock, one would not arrive at the present Invention because the binder in Maeda is not a polymer having side chains where those side chains form the crosslink between the polymers.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims are patentable over Barcock and Maeda taken alone or in combination.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present Application is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should any fees or extensions of time be necessary in order to maintain this Application in pending condition, appropriate requests

are hereby made and authorization is given to debit account
#02-2275.

Respectfully submitted,

LUCAS & MERCANTI, LLP

By: Donald C. Lucas
Donald C. Lucas, Reg. # 31,275
(Attorney for Applicants)
475 Park Avenue South
New York, New York 10016
Tel. # (212) 661-8000

DCL/mr